

Date: Sat, 14 May 94 04:30:06 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #203
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 14 May 94 Volume 94 : Issue 203

Today's Topics:

Code test speeds (4 msgs)
Music allowed on ham bands??

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 12 May 94 11:59:10 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!newshub.sdsu.edu!nic-nac.CSU.net!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!
gatech!newsfeed.pitt.edu!dsinc!wells!w2up!barry@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Code test speeds
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

William=E.=Newkirk%Pubs%GenAv.Mlb@ns14.cca.CR.rockwell.COM writes:

> I think maybe it should just go:
>
> Novice/Tech Plus (element 1A) 5 WPM
> General/Advanced (element 1B) 10 WPM
> Extra (element 1C) 15 WPM
>
> 73, bill wb9ivr

I think the theory should be simplified too. Name and address is all that
should be required. We shouldn't be discriminatory - there are morons out
there who can't learn theory either.

=====
Barry N. Kutner, W2UP Usenet/Internet: barry@w2up.wells.com
Newtown, PA Packet Radio: W2UP @ WB3JOE.#EPA.PA.USA.NA
 Packet Cluster: W2UP >K2TW (FRC)
.....

Date: Thu, 12 May 1994 21:18:53 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!math.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!library.ucla.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!modem58.ucdavis.edu!
ddtodd@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Code test speeds
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

hamilton@BIX.com (hamilton on BIX) writes:

>Why, for heavens' sake? The code's not that difficult. I went from
>not knowing it to passing 13 wpm in about two months using the ARRL tapes.
>And trust me, this was some kind of obsession during those two months. It
>was 10 or 15 minutes a day every day or two when I had some time. That
>was in Feb. Since then, I've tried to follow the same liesurely pace and
>now find that 15 is fairly easy and 20 looks attainable by the fall sometime.
I am happy for you, you should be allowed to purue whatever part of our hobby
makes you happy

>If I can do it that easily, anyone can do it. I certainly have no special
No, that is not true, I worked on Super Morse for two months straight, 1/2 and
hour a day, every day, and I still can't copy 10 much less 13 wpm. And here I
am with my advanced csce.

>"ear" for this stuff. Anyway, certainly the Extra's supposed to be a
>"stretch" -- otherwise, what's the sense of accomplishment of earning
>it?

Why do think the extra should be some sense of accomplishment. Don't you get
enough sense of accomplishment by simply reaching a goal? Does the FCC have
to pat you on the back for you to feel good? Teh exams are not there to make
you accomplish anything they are supposed to be there to prevent mayhem in the
amateur bands and keep incompetent operators off the air. I really fail to
see how a CW exam accomplishes either of these goals.

>I say leave things where they are. Or if there are changes to be made,
>consider some "Extra-Extra" licenses for really high-speed code (> 30 wpm)
>or for demonstration of special skills in handling emergency traffic, etc.
Go for paper! Why do you feel there has to be some kind of government
intervention in our lives. The ARRL gives awards for high speed copying. If

that's your cup of tea go for it.

good luck on 20,
Dan

```
=====
Dan Todd          ddtodd@ucdavis.edu          kc6uud@ke6lw.#nocal.ca.us.na
Charter Member: Dummies for UNIX
-----
```

When radios are outlawed, only outlaws will have radios
- David R. Tucker on rec.radio.amateur.policy
=====

```
-----
Date: Fri, 13 May 1994 01:02:12 GMT
From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!nuntius@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Code test speeds
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu
```

In article <1994May12.142949.849@pacs.sunbelt.net> Dorr R. Depew - A.R.S.
N4QIX, ddepew@CHM.TEC.SC.US writes:

```
>Greg -- WELL SAID! CW is a discipline as well as a (highly enjoyable)
form
>of amateur communication -- the main reason for lowering the code
requirement
>is to sell equipment and let all kinds of no-brains into the hobby.
There
>are enough of them already...80 meters at night sounds like CB!
```

I must have read the rules differently than you.....I thought you
still needed code to work 80 meters.....you mean that code isn't a
lid filter after all.....Wonders will never cease to amaze me.

```
-----
Date: Fri, 13 May 1994 00:39:32 GMT
From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!nuntius@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Code test speeds
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu
```

In article <1994May12.123437.27847@cs.brown.edu> Michael P. Deignan,
md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu writes:

```
>If the ham community wants to go ahead and change the requirements
around,
>that's fine (even if I don't necessarily agree with what the change may
be.)
>However, the day we start letting vendors determine what the rules,
```

>regulations, and licensing requirements are in ham radio is the day we
>might as well just give our bandwidth back to the FCC so they can
>reallocate it to commercial use.

Mike,

In many cases the "industry" people are in sync with the pulse of regulators. I don't know for a fact that this is the case, but lets suppose they are working for a type acceptance on a radio, and discussing the matter with someone at the FCC. He might make an off hand remark like "you're wasting your time on this one as the commission is looking at a change that will give away that spectrum.....I would hope he might be willing to get some hams in a lather so as to find ways to exercise the spectrum in question. Now this is just a fictitious example, but I have had dealings with other Government agencies along a similar line. Just because there is a market for an item doesn't make the manufacturer a bad guy. Are your real opposed to a free market? If the number of hams went up sharply, it follows the demand for ham related products would follow.....and the next thing you know maybe someone with a clever idea might find enough market share to drive the prices down.....

Rick Aldom

Date: 13 May 94 22:20:03 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!biosci!netnews.synoptics.com!news@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: Music allowed on ham bands??
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker) Wrote:

>Pretty gray, isn't it? If you take data bits off your CD, send them
>to me, and I play them on my audio system, you're transmitting music,
>we can agree, and that's not legal, even if someone with an analog
>receiver couldn't tell (maybe F2E emission?) Your transmission is
>digital rather than analog (say F3E), but that makes no difference.
>If, instead, you send them into my computer where they're stored until
>later, well, that looks like any other data transmission. Perfectly
>kosher - you're just transmitting a file like any other (well, that's
>the question, isn't it?

After those bits hit your hard drive dont forget to send reasonable compensation to the RIAA, ASCAP and anyone else who has their hand out. Just to be legal ;-)

Dave
wa6qwl

Date: Thu, 12 May 1994 21:23:39 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!math.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!library.ucla.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!modem58.ucdavis.edu!
ddtodd@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CpHMBz.263@cbnewst.cb.att.com>, <2qljo2\$qvs@dancer.cc.bellcore.com>,
<31545@uswnvg.uswnvg.com>e
Subject : Re: Antenna CC&R restrictions -- let's change the law

cjackso@uswnvg.com (Clay Jackson) writes:

>I disagree - there's PLENTY of precedent in from the 'Civil Rights Days'.
>The Feds decided to push (HARD!) the states into getting tough on local
>CC&Rs (and zoning, and..) that restricted blacks (and others) in various
>ways. Also, the "action(s)" at the Federal Level don't necessarily have
>to be 'laws' per se. How about getting FEMA to withdraw funding/support/
>disaster recovery services to any locality that had ordinances that violated
>the spirit of PRB-1 and/or allowed CC&Rs which did the same. In a LOT of
>places, that would certainly stir up some action!

As much as I hate CC&Rs againt antennas I am not willing to give up state
rights to the federal government effect therse changes. If it is not in the
realm of federal legislation then talk to your State Representatives. It is
because of this kind of ridiculous indirect pressure that most states now have
drinking age of 21 and why we were stuck with 55mph speed limits on the
freeways in Nevada. It has now improved to 65mph whoopee.
Let the Feds do what we gave them the responsibility to do in the constitution
and likewise with the sataes.

cheers,
dan

=====

Dan Todd	ddtodd@ucdavis.edu	kc6uud@ke6lw.#nocal.ca.us.na
----------	--------------------	------------------------------

Charter Member: Dummies for UNIX

When radios are outlawed, only outlaws will have radios
- David R. Tucker on rec.radio.amateur.policy

=====

Date: 13 May 94 09:48:20 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!news.tufts.edu!
news.hnrc.tufts.edu!jerry@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <9405111559.AA00194@hwking.cca.rockwell.com>,

<BPL8Lc3w165w@w2up.wells.com>, <SR0.94May12193553@media-lab.media.mit.edu>
Subject : Re: Code test speeds

In article <SR0.94May12193553@media-lab.media.mit.edu>, sro@media.mit.edu (Shawn O'Donnell) writes:

> What's so special about the code?

I suspect you already know, but I hope you'll forgive me for saying it anyway.
Two things:

(1) Most bang for the buck, i.e., easiest to get an intelligible signal through with minimum bandwidth.

(2) [I need help on this one.] I thought it was **required** by international treaty. I say 'thought' because I don't know how the no-Code Tech class is able to coexist along with these requirements.

Comment 1: IMO, CW is to amateur radio as programming is to computers. (BTW, I agree the statement is equally valid with many other skills replacing CW in the analogy.) In both cases, you can go a long way without the special skill, but that special skill adds immeasurably to one's capabilities.

Comment 2: If not code, then what should be used to help regulate the distribution of a valuable resource? While many hams do the right thing and learn the required theory, I suspect there are many who got their licenses by memorizing the pool. If the code requirement were eliminated, too, what would be left?

In almost every case where a recognition of achievement is awarded (driver's license, advanced degree) there is a rite of passage (driving test, thesis defense) that must be endured. Nearly everyone curses it, but in retrospect the rite is what provides some of the greatest satisfaction.

I hate the words "constructive criticism." Feel free to criticize the code requirement without having to propose an alternative. But I would point out that if this requirement is watered down, then achieving a higher license class will be that much less of an achievement. Also, I need not mention what happens in the limit when there are no requirements or the requirements are heavily diluted. One need only tune in to the appropriate frequencies . . . (This last line is not a defense of CW, per se. It's just a reminder that **some** rigorous rite of passage is essential for the health of amateur radio.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #203
